UNITED NATIONS

A E

General Assembly

Economic and Social Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/46/206/Add.3.
E/1991/93/Add.3
14 June 1991

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Forty-sixth session
Item 83 of the preliminary list*
OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL
Second regular session of 1991
OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT

Operational activities of the United Nations system

Note by the Secretary-General

Addendum

1. In paragraph 16 of its resolution 44/211, the General Assembly recognized the urgent need to improve the field representation of the United Nations system and requested the Director-General for Development and International Economic Cooperation to present at its forty-sixth session a report containing comprehensive information, drawing on all relevant reports on the field representation of the United Nations system. Part I of the addendum contains factual information in support of section V of this year's annual report.

2. The General Assembly, in its resolution 44/211, placed importance on the full use of national capacities and during the forty-fifth session considerable interest was expressed by delegations on progress in national execution of programmes and projects. Consequently, the Director-General conducted a review, the main findings of which are summarized in section II of the present addendum and supports section VI.B of the annual report for 1991.

3. In accordance with paragraph 15 (d) of resolution 44/211, section III of the addendum provides information on common premises of the United Nations system at the country level, including a table depicting the situation country by country.

---

* A/46/50.

ANNEX

Report of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Cooperation on Operational Activities

CONTENTS

		Paragraphs	Page
I.	FIELD REPRESENTATION	1 - 15	3
	A. Field networks of the organizations of the United Nations system: 1973-1990	1 - 10	3
	B. Staff office costs	11 - 13	10
	C. Project staff	14 - 15	12
II.	PROGRESS REPORT ON NATIONAL EXECUTION	16 - 28	12
III.	COMMON PREMISES AND SHARED FACILITIES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES	29 - 39	17
	A. General comments	29 - 33	17
	B. CCSQ/OPS	34 - 35	18
	C. Joint Consultative Group on Policy	36 - 39	19
	D. Information on common premises at the country level		20

I. FIELD REPRESENTATION

A. Field networks of the organizations of the United Nations system: 1973-1990

1. This section of the addendum contains factual information in support of section V of the annual report for 1991. It updates the data a/ contained in section II.A to C of the JIU report on Field representation of organizations of the United Nations system: structure and coordination (see A/41/424) with a view to discerning the trends that have characterized field representation among organizations of the system between 1983 (the last year of the decade covered by the JIU report) and 1990.

2. In order to be consistent with the JIU report a determination was made whether field offices were regional or subregional or country specific in scope. One agency describes some offices as regional but states that a regional office covers the organization's affairs and formally represents it in a number of countries in a geographic region. In order to bring some consistency into a possibly irreconcilable situation, such an office was counted as a subregional office for the purpose of this report. Liaison offices have been excluded whenever they are intended to liaise only with other United Nations agencies but not with Governments or non-United Nations bodies. Thus, liaison offices in Geneva and New York, having as their main or sole purpose to maintain contacts with other United Nations offices in those two cities, have been excluded.

3. The physical location of a unit in the field has not been a determining factor in deciding how to classify offices. Thus, a subregional, or a country office located in the same city, or even in the same premises as a regional office of the same agency, is counted separately. Similarly, a regional, subregional or country office located at a headquarters duty station is counted separately. Whenever a regional office is located in a developed country but covers developing countries, it is counted as being located in the latter.

4. Following the JIU classification, UNFPA and WFP are recorded separately, even though they are represented by the UNDP Resident Representative. United Nations information centres have all been included, even where the Resident Representative/Regional Coordinator acts as Centre Director because in periods between assignments of Directors appointed by the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat, the Resident Representative becomes in several cases the ad interim Director. In cases where he is permanently so, DPI is fully represented by an office which is separate from the UNDP office. For the first time data on the field representation of the World Bank is being provided, but it is not included in the tables because JIU had not included the Bank in its study, and because the data would not easily fit into the categories used.

5. The following general elements emerge from the data: UNDP has been stable, with the closing of one office in Europe and the conversion of the Geneva establishment into a liaison unit. UNHCR adapts its field structure to crises of a natural or political character as they arise. Therefore, the relative scope and role of respective field units shift constantly. The Agency does not open a new office if an existing one can cope with increased duties. Closures of sub-offices or field units are most often attributable to the achievement of a durable solution. UNICEF data have proved difficult to relate to the JIU data and no conclusions can be drawn. UNFPA has expanded in the past seven years due to the increased complexity of UNFPA-supported programmes. The number of UNICs, has remained stable with only four new offices opened, two in developing countries and two in the developed world. While 21 offices were headed by a Resident Coordinator in 1983, this was the case for 25 in 1990. Out of 67 field UNIC units 29 covered more than one country, and thus fall into the category of subregional offices. Finally, WFP field representation increased by 4 per cent with a much higher growth in programme delivery. This is explained by the existence, already in 1973, of 73 offices, while UNICEF, for example, had only 29 offices that year, according to the JIU study.

6. Among specialized agencies, WHO remained stable, while ILO, FAO, UNESCO and UNIDO have increased their presence in developing countries. FAO's Council decided in July 1976 "to establish a network of country representatives as part of an effort to decentralize the Organization". Since then there has been an extensive opening of country offices. The total of such representatives authorized by the FAO Conference stands at 78. FAO, citing paragraph 15 of resolution 44/211, in which the General Assembly emphasized "that the United Nations system at country level should be structured and composed in such a way that it corresponds to ongoing and projected co-operation", indicates that, given the diversity of country situations and development priorities, no rigid pattern of field representation should be applied. UNIDO agreed with UNDP in April 1989 to convert Senior Industrial Development Field Advisers (SIDFA) into UNIDO Country Directors, a change comparable to that in UNFPA and WFP. This agency's expansion reflects the importance given to the UNIDO Country Directors network both by the Governing Bodies of UNDP and UNIDO. The established criteria for opening offices are: emphasis on industrialization, sizeable current and future technical assistance activities, special needs for assistance, the presence of other international agencies such as regional development banks, central geographical location enabling coverage of neighbouring countries. Since financing of UNIDO Country Directors depends on income from support cost successor arrangements, it is not possible to forecast future expansion, if any. Notwithstanding this uncertainty, a proposal for a long-term financing scheme was submitted to UNIDO's Board in November 1990. The Board requested further consultations with UNDP for the progressive increase of Country Directors. UNESCO's general policy with respect to field offices is being examined this year by its Executive Board.

7. Smaller agencies have, on the whole, not modified their pattern of offices. UPU, IMO and ITC still have no field offices. ITU has established a field network since the JIU 1983 survey (11 offices). ITU's regional presence was initiated in application of resolution 26 adopted at the Nairobi Plenipotentiary Conference. Following the 1989 Nice Plenipotentiary Conference and beginning in 1990, ITU's regional presence has been strengthened and is now on Regional and Area Offices responsible for operational activities for groups of countries. Two of WMO's regional offices, initially located in Geneva, i.e. for Africa and for the Americas were moved to the respective regions in 1978 and 1981, while the third, for Asia, remains in Geneva. WMO does not anticipate further opening of regional or other external offices, owing to the nature of its programmes and activities, and expected levels of resources.

8. With the increase in national capacity more short-term missions and fewer resident experts are required. This may involve more administrative work for field offices in terms of travel arrangements, payments of various kinds, accommodation, as well as other support to projects. National execution may result in an increase in the workload of some field offices, as the day-to-day administrative management of projects is left to them for various reasons, including lack of familiarity on the part of national personnel with United Nations procedures and practices. This is particularly true for UNDP field offices.

9. Organizations with normative mandates have assigned their field staff increasingly to promote the adoption and application of standards. In many cases, field offices devote themselves to fostering relations at the country and regional levels with constituents of their organizations.

10. The World Bank has suplied information indicating that in 1990 it had 53 Field Offices, of which 3 were located in developed countries, and another 3 provided regional coverage. Thus, the World Bank currently has 47 country offices.

Table 1. Field network

Field representation from 1983 to 1990: number of offices

(a) Offices in and/or for developing countries

Organizations United Nations	Number of offices 1983	1990	Percentage increase or decrease 1983 over 1990
UNDP	112	110	-2
UNHCR	48	70	46
UNFPA a/	(31)	(65)	110
UNICEF	85 b/	75	-12
UNEP c/	4	4	-
UNIC	47	49	4
WFP a/	(82)	(82)	-
ECA	7	5	-29
ECLAC	7	6	-14
ESCAP	2	1	-50
ESCWA	1	-	-100
Subtotal	271	320	18
ILO	27	28	4
FAO	64	78	20
WHO	93	89	-6
UNIDO a/	(33)	(38)	15
UNESCO	33	35	6
ICAO	6	6	-
ITU c/	-	9	-
WMO c/	3	3	-
Subtotal	226	248	8
Total	497	568	14
Incl. UNFPA, UNIDO and WFP	(146) (643)	(185) (753)	(27) (17)

/...

Table 1 (continued)

(b) Offices in and for developed countries (excluding headquarters)

Organizations United Nations	Number of offices 1983	1990	Percentage increase or decrease 1983 over 1990
UNDP	4	8	100
UNHCR	15	21	40
UNFPA	1	1	-
UNICEF	4 d/	4 d/	-
UNEP e/	2	2	-
UNIC	16	18	12
UNITAR	1	1	-
WFP	2	-	-100
ECE	1	2	100
ECLAC	1	1	-
Subtotal	43	58	31
ILO	11	12	9
FAO f/	3	2	-
WHO	2	2	-
UNIDO g/	6	8	-
UNESCO	7	5	-29
ICAO	1	1	-
Subtotal	30	30	-
Total	75	89	23
Grand total			
Incl. UNFPA, UNIDO and WFP	572 (718)	657 (842)	15 17

Source: The figures for 1983 are taken from the JIU report (A/41/424, annex) except for UNICEF. All totals are based on JIU data. Any differences are explained by the data used for UNICEF.

(Footnotes on following page)

(Footnotes to table 1)

---

a/ UNFPA, WFP and UNIDO are shown but not included in totals as explained in para. 4.

b/ Figures provided by UNICEF.

c/ UNDP, ITU and WMO were not included in the statistics of the JIU report but are included in this one since data is available for 1983 and 1990.

d/ Figures provided by UNICEF.

e/ UNDP, ITU, UNITAR/Europe and WMO were not included in the statistics of the JIU report but are included in this one since data is available for 1983 and 1990.

f/ The figure for 1983 probably included a liaison office.

g/ Investment Promotion Services.

Table 2. Comparison of 1983 and 1990

Field offices using three different categories and percentage changes

Office	Year	I Basic field network as per JIU/REP/86/1		II Includes data in column I plus UNDP, UNITAR ITU, WHO, UNFPA, UNIDO outside UNDP offices		III Includes data in columns I and II plus UNFPA, UNIDO and WFP UNFPA, UNIDO and WFP in developing countries	
Country	1983	406		413		559	
	1990	491	21%	500	21%	685	22%
Subregional	1983	84		84		84	
	1990	93	11%	100	19%	100	19%
Regional	1983	65		75		75	
	1990	43	-34% a/	57	-24%	57	-24%
Total	1983	555		572		718	
	1990	627	13%	657	15%	842	17%

Source: The figures for 1983 are based on the report of JIU (A/41/424, annex).

a/ Some of the decline may be accounted for by a difference in the criteria applied by JIU.

B. Staff and office costs

11. The distinction in regard to staff is not - as in the case of field offices - between field establishments in developing and developed countries but between headquarters and other established offices. This category is used for official CCAQ statistics on which this section is based.

12. The following conclusions and observations on some aspects of table 4 can be drawn. Both total numbers and percentages vary within narrow limits. The trend in the intervening six years (1983-1989) does not constitute a shift of staff away from Headquarters. In the case of the Agency, there is an increase of field units from 63 to 91, i.e.: a 46 per cent increase, and an increase of Staff of 76 per cent. UNICEF increased the percentage of staff in the field to 81 per cent. At UNFPA, field office staff represented 66 per cent of all non-project staff in 1990 (figure for 1983 not available); the number of staff increased from 344 in 1983 to 458 in 1990 (i.e.: by over 33 per cent). There is a strong trend towards an increase of National Professional Officers whose number has more than doubled. At UNDP National Professional Officers increased from 165 in 1983 to 316 in 1990 (plus 92 per cent). The Agency, which did not employ any National Professional Officers in 1983 had 34 in 1989. For UNICEF, the figures are an increase from 156 to 473 (plus 203 per cent). WHO is also making increased use of this category.

13. The World Bank provided figures showing that it has 262 professional staff, 739 local staff (majority support staff), and 37 secondment staff.

Table 3. Staff and office

Field representation for 1983 to 1989: number of staff

Organizations	1983 Staff at non-Hq. offices Prof.	G.S.	(%) a/	1989 Staff at non-Hq. offices Prof.	G.S.	(%)
UNDP	615	4 005	81	1 031	3 837	78
UNHCR	220	723	67	330	1 089	74
UNICEF b/	703	1 409	75	1 169	2 033	81
ILO	141	256	23	121	269	23
FAO	234	655	18	238	748	23
UNESCO	216	301	17	223	331	22
WHO	401	1 216	57	493	1 487	59
ICAO	83	123	23	73	113	23
ITU	-	-	-	15	10	2
WMO	5	2	2	5	2	2
IMO	-	-	-	-	-	-
IAEA	-	-	-	-	-	-
UNIDO c/	84	88	N.A.	135	101	N.A.
TOTAL	2 702 d/	8 824	-	3 833	10 020	-

Source: CCAQ personnel statistics (Documents ACC/1984/PER/37 of 13 August 1984 and ACC/1990/PER/R.6 of 28 August 1990). To ensure a common and comparable database the official CCAQ were used, except for UNIDO which had to be provided directly.

a/ Staff at non-headquarters established offices as a percentage of all staff at established offices.

b/ Data supplied by UNICEF.

c/ Data supplied by UNIDO.

d/ Includes National Professional Officers. For those agencies for which data is available for 1983 and 1989, National Professional Officers numbered 321 and 743 respectively (an increase of 131 per cent).

C. Project staff

14. The decrease in professional project staff noted by the JIU for the period 1974 to 1983 has been confirmed for the years 1983 to 1989, with two exceptions. For the organizations listed below the decline is 39 per cent. Between 1974 and 1983, the decline for all organizations was 4.6 per cent.

Table 4. Project staff

Project staff 1983 and 1989 by organizations

Organizations	Project staff 1983	Project staff 1989	Change in percentage
UNITED NATIONS	1 997	1 020 a/	(49)
ILO	585	614	5
FAO	1 719	1 208	(30)
UNESCO	251	107	(79)
WHO	640	407	(36)
ICAO	329	173	(47)
ITU	185	92	(50)
UPU	6	9	50
TOTAL	5 712	3 630	(39)

Source: CCAQ personnel statistics. This category refers to personnel with a contract of at least one year.

a/ This reflects a decrease that includes a separate accounting of UNIDO project staff, which in 1989 stood at 236.

15. Although the figures provided in table 4 above do not provide a full picture, they show clearly that a sharp decrease in long-term project personnel has taken place. Greater national capacity is probably one of the main reasons. More sophisticated support is required today and there are fewer requests for long-term personnel for institution-building projects, as compared to short-term support, often recruited nationally.

II. PROGRESS REPORT ON NATIONAL EXECUTION

16. This section provides further details in support of section VI.B of the annual report. It reports on a survey launched in January 1991, in which Resident Coordinators were asked to report on:

(a) The manner in which national capacities were identified, assessed and utilized for the purpose of national execution;

(b) The criteria applied and the constraints encountered in the pursuit of this modality;

(c) The difference, if any, in the approaches of UNDP, UNICEF, WFP and UNFPA;

(d) The steps taken to improve and foster the utilization of national capacities, both by the United Nations system and by Governments;

(e) Measures used to ensure proper accountability in financial and in programme terms.

17. Replies from the field have identified a number of requirements to ensure the successful resort to national execution, including:

(a) Acceptance by the central authorities of the country, of the principle of national execution;

(b) Existence or potential for improvement of capacity in Government or in project counterpart institutions, judged by direct observation or from previous experience;

(c) Sufficient delegation of authority to the implementing institution and clear definition of monitoring and reporting arrangements, possibly through periodic visits and/or joint steering committees, with participation of specialized agencies, or other external agents, as needed and appropriate;

(d) Joint screening in choice of national project directors;

(e) Nature of assistance (for example, high technology projects are less amenable to national implementation than socially targeted programmes);

(f) Satisfactory accounting and auditing arrangements;

(g) Clear work plan.

18. Among the impediments encountered in extending the principle of national execution, the following were more commonly reported:

(a) A perception of centralization at UNDP and complicated programming, reporting and accounting procedures in the United Nations system, particularly in view of their variation from organization to organization, and considering that these are "aid" programmes intended to be helpful rather than impose burdens;

(b) Large numbers of relatively small projects which impose disproportionate administrative loads on the executing institutions;

(c) Bureaucratic rigidities and centralization in government (e.g., restrictions on opening foreign currency accounts);

(d) Different fiscal cycles of government and the aid organizations;

(e) Difficulty in assuring selection of project personnel on merit only in view of the relative attractive compensation offered, based on best prevailing local rates;

(f) Inadequate remuneration of national staff and need for public service reform;

(g) Administrative weakness in some neglected sectors (e.g., social);

(h) Legal and financial difficulties in making local contractual arrangements and insufficient familiarity with international tendering;

(i) Insufficient budgetary provision for administrative staff in counterpart institutions.

19. To deal with these and other situations and based on successful experience, acquired particularly by UNICEF and WFP, execution modalities are being used which combine full national responsibility with various degrees of implementation support at field levels. Many Resident Coordinators indicate that the necessary skills to support project operations can often be found within the country. Moreover, field offices and some United Nations organizations are providing support services directly through their staff, or indirectly through support units which draw on the full range of national available skills.

20. National execution may involve capacity-building at central, sectoral and non-governmental (e.g., communities of beneficiaries, universities, research institutions) levels. Hence, this concept has a much broader application than simply concentrating on central aid management capacities of recipient Governments.

21. For WFP and UNICEF, national execution is the norm, with responsibility assumed by national authorities. The extent of support provided in the implementation of operations varies according to prevailing conditions, as determined at the time programmes are formulated. While both organizations handle themselves the external purchase and transport of commodities, the national setting affects the manner in which other elements of a programme on project implementation are handled. Programme audits and financial accounting involve the field staff of these organizations, with periodic reviews of performance, as frequently as every quarter, but usually semi-annually or annually. UNICEF provides for a mid-term review within the life span of a programme. Both WFP and UNICEF have in varying degrees recourse to the technical inputs of United Nations specialized agencies at some stage of the operational process: in design, formulation and appraisal of programmes and projects, occasionally in their monitoring (particularly for WFP) and in evaluation.

22. For UNDP and UNFPA, country-by-country judgement is exercised at the identification and formulation stages, or at the time of appraisal and approval of a project or programme. The UNDP Administrator, or his designate, decide on execution arrangements in consultation with the Government, and decisions on the designation of national execution normally require referral to Headquarters. Replies from countries where national execution is intended to be the norm indicate that participation of specialized agencies is foreseen in some elements of implementation, and the support of field offices is expected.

23. Explanations for the differences between UNDP and other funding agencies are based on the way the nature and content of the assistance are being offered. While UNDP covers a wide range of sectoral issues and, therefore, deals with a multiplicity of national entities of uneven capacity, the other JCGP agencies deal with fewer national institutions and have a narrower substantive focus. Therefore, they develop within their headquarters and field offices, the necessary technical know-how and can ensure, through hands-on experience and training, institutional and staff capacity for national implementation. As concerns UNDP, the specialized agencies have played the role as providers of technical know-how.

24. The distinction between "execution" and "implementation" of programmes and projects was brought out in the replies as concerns UNDP-supported projects. General responsibility involving execution, or the overall responsibility and management of all stages of the project and programme cycles was considered to be uniquely that of Governments. The practical implementation, on the other hand, typically involving the procurement of specified project inputs in accordance with a work plan, required a range of support, nationally or internationally obtained. Thus, national execution generally consisted of a mix of arrangements aimed at ensuring full responsibility for the development programme by national institutions, while often involving external support for specific tasks. The wide range of field experience with such arrangements, and the use of excellent models in a number of specific national situations, provide fertile ground for transferring successful experience among countries.

25. The intent of General Assembly resolution 44/211 is to encourage the specialized agencies to move further towards a role in technical cooperation based on their information exchange, roles of standard setting and centres of excellence, gradually to decrease their involvement in the day-to-day operational administration. This is now being done at the field level through a variety of approaches developed under present rules in keeping with local requirements. The success or arrangements to support costs, which will come into force in January 1992, will further affect the manner in which UNDP-supported operational activities will be carried out in the future. While the choices available to Governments concerning technical partners are expected to expand, the agencies of the United Nations system will continue to play the principal technical and professional role.

26. The United Nations system provides a variety of support services through its field office network. Steps have been taken to improve national available capacity through the following:

(a) Substantive training and exposure to the main technical issues within the modalities of the organizations;

(b) Training programmes in United Nations system procedures for project preparation, and in administrative duties for nationals, including local instruction manuals;

(c) Sensitizing workshops and seminars for participants at various governmental levels, from policy to operational, and for non-governmental organizations, universities and others;

(d) Rosters of national consultants or consulting firms to serve in the implementation process;

(e) Setting up, within Government or outside, special servicing units for national execution, funded by UNDP or Government resources;

(f) Identifying and correcting bureaucratic hurdles with technical support of the United Nations system.

27. In countries which foresee full national implementation acceptable, programme accountability often implies involvement of suitable external agents to provide UNDP/UNFPA field offices with professional judgement on the performance of projects. Resident Coordinators in more countries foresee that specialized agencies will provide in most cases the necessary technical know-how to do the "programme audit" demanded by the accountability requirement.

28. In Asia and Latin America, where the process is more advanced, responses from the field indicate substantial resort to specialized agencies at various stages of the programming and delivery process, depending on availability of national capacities. Occasionally, other repositories of international knowledge are being tapped, but the basic partnership among all organizations of the United Nations system continues to operate and specialized agencies continue to play their role in technical support and guidance. b/ However, agencies indicate that their role as associated agencies has not worked out. Agencies will continue to assist in design and formulation of programmes and projects or in appraisal, monitoring and evaluation. Agencies, and sometimes other qualified internationally obtained specialized services, play a crucial role on behalf of UNDP and of other funding organizations. These additional services are an essential part of technical cooperation, without which it could become no more than a mere budget support arrangement. The necessity of a proper international programme-audit is understood by recipient Governments as being essential to ensuring the independent assessment of programme results.

III. COMMON PREMISES AND SHARED FACILITIES IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

A. General comments

29. The General Assembly, in paragraph 15 (d) of its resolution 44/211, decided "to request all organs, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system to make, without delay, the necessary arrangements, in cooperation with host Governments and without additional cost to developing countries, to establish common premises at the country level, and to request the Director-General to include in his annual report on operational activities information on progress in that area".

30. Common premises were established in all instances where sufficient office capacity exists and existing contractual arrangements permit such action. At present, one out of three FAO, UNESCO and ILO offices share premises with UNDP. WHO, ITU, ICAO, the World Bank and IMF normally have separate premises. More than half of UNICs, about one fifth of UNICEF and the same number of UNHCR offices share premises with UNDP. The only organizations which are always housed with UNDP are UNFPA, WFP and UNIDO, the reason being that the UNDP resident representative officially represents these agencies.

31. During the period under review, progress has been achieved in terms of actual construction of common premises in eight countries; active negotiations are under way in 10 countries and plans are under consideration in two countries. In two other countries existing common premises are being extended.

32. Other organizations of the United Nations system have indicated their support of the principle of common services and shared facilities. In October 1990, the one hundred and thirty-fifth session of the UNESCO Executive Board requested a review of the possibility of establishing common premises at the country level. Moreover, UNESCO joined this past year common premises in four countries (Ecuador, Pakistan, Malaysia and Morocco). It should be noted that nearly half of the current premises of UNESCO field units are offered free of charge by host Governments, thus making it sometimes uneconomical for UNESCO to move to common premises.

33. WHO policy is to place its field offices in or near the Ministry of Health whenever possible. This maximizes the technical advice and support provided by WHO to national health administration for national health programme development. Almost all present premises of WHO are provided free of charge by host Governments. Other organizations face the situation that premises and services are being provided by the relevant sectoral ministries, making any change uneconomical.

B. CCSQ/OPS

34. As part of the guidelines issued by the Director-General on enhancing the role and effectiveness of the Resident Coordinator system (see para. 55 of the annual report for 1991), it was agreed by all organizations of the United Nations system "to encourage the sharing of common premises and services, unless particular requirements on material conditions impose limitations on such sharing".

35. At its October 1990 meeting, CCSQ/OPS adopted the following inter-organizational position on the sharing of common premises:

> "While the sharing of common premises is not a sine qua non for more effective coordination at the country level, it could be greatly facilitated by it. The sharing of premises and services could additionally bring about economies.
>
> It is the policy of all organizations to encourage the sharing of premises; particular requirements or material conditions may nevertheless impose limitations on such sharing and hence warrant other arrangements.
>
> It is recognized that the establishment of United Nations field premises has to take account of conditions on an individual country basis and to correspond to the wishes of the host Government. In a number of countries, sectoral ministries desire that, in view also of the nature and extent of their collaboration on an ongoing basis, the sectoral agency of the United Nations be located in the relevant ministry; some sectoral agency representatives are in fact integrated with the relevant ministry. In other instances the host Government authority provides free or subsidized accommodation for the United Nations agency.
>
> Subject to the foregoing, all field representatives are requested to cooperate fully with resident coordinators in achieving the maximum degree of sharing of common premises and services.
>
> In the spirit of their commitment to the widest possible sharing of premises, organizations also invite the Office of the Director-General for Development and International Economic Cooperation to draw their attention to any new possibilities for such sharing."

The Committee also suggested that the system build up a case study of examples of successful collaboration arrangements at the country level and of the problems encountered. To that end, it invited member organizations to provide the Director-General and the Coordinator, of CCSQ/OPS with the relevant information.

C. Joint Consultative Group on Policy

36. The Joint Consultative Group on Policy (JCGP) composed of UNDP, UNICEF, WFP and IFAD, continues to give high priority to the establishment of common premises and facilities. A permanent Sub-Group on Common Premises and Services has been established to oversee each common premises project, including planning, design, financing, construction and management.

37. Common premises for the JCGP members are under preparation in seven countries. c/ In addition, requests for the construction of common premises have been received from Bangladesh, Brazil, the Central African Republic, Haiti, Nigeria, Pakistan and Zaire. The construction of office premises in these countries is estimated at $38 million. Since the funds currently available cannot accommodate these requests, the JCGP Sub-Group on Common Premises and Services is exploring the possibility of obtaining financing from the private sector. Under this arrangement the Government would donate land to UNDP which, in turn, would lease the land for financiers to construct premises which in turn would be leased to UNDP on a long-term basis. At the end of the lease of the premises, the United Nations system would assume ownership. The office space would then be rent-free, except for future maintenance, which would be pro-rated according to the space occupied by each agency. UNDP would be responsible for the management of the office premises. In the case of Zaire, negotiations are now being finalized with a firm in the private sector to construct the office premises under this modality.

38. It should be noted that the cost of construction of common premises, whether financed from the Reserve for Field Accommodation or the private sector under the lease/buy option, is being borne by JCGP members on a proportionate cost-sharing basis as mandated by General Assembly resolution 42/196. Examples of such sharing of cost exist in Somalia and Zambia. Similar sharing of costs will be applied to all future construction, thus lessening the financial burden placed on UNDP.

39. The following decisions on common premises were taken by the governing bodies of JCGP members:

(a) The Executive Board of UNICEF approved the authorization of a Reserve Fund for Field Office Accommodation and staff housing for a maximum of $22 million;

(b) The UNDP Governing Council, in its decision 90/44, authorized the Administrator to utilize as a last resort, the Reserve for Field Accommodation when such purchases would be shared with organizations of JCGP and to the extent possible, other United Nations organizations in the field. By its decision 89/57, the Administrator was authorized to over-commit the Reserve for Field Accommodation by up to $10 million, while ensuring that funds disbursed from the reserve not exceed $25 million in any one year;

(c) UNFPA is approaching its Governing Council for the authorization to establish a revolving fund of $5 million patterned along the UNDP Reserve for Field Accommodation.

D. Country level information on common premises

(as at May 1991)

Country	Sharing	Separate premises	Remarks
Afghanistan	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNIC/ FAO	WHO, a/ UNGOMAP, UNICEF, UNOCA, UNHCR	
Algeria	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNICEF/ UNHCR/ILO/UNIC/UNIDO		
Angola	UNDP/UNFPA/UNICEF/WFP/ UNIDO/WHO/FAO/ SRPA (CCU)	UNAVEM	Expansion of common premises under way. UNICEF, UNDP, UNFPA, WFP, UNIDO, WHO, FAO have committed funds for renovation to maintain common premises.
Argentina		UNDP, UNHCR, ILO, WHO, UNICEF, ECLAC, UNIDO, UNIC, IBRD	
Bahamas		WHO	UNDP activities handled by Jamaica Office.
Bahrain	UNDP/UNICEF	UNHCR, UNIC, UNEP	
Bangladesh	UNDP/UNIDO	IBRD, IMF, WFP, UNIC, UNHCR, WHO, ILO, FAO, UNICEF, UNFPA	Awaiting land from Government to construct common premises using private sector funds. UNICEF and UNDP have committed funds for this purpose.
Barbados	UNDP/WFP/UNIDO/UNCHS/ UNFDAC	WHO, FAO, UNICEF	
Belize		WHO	

/...

Country	Sharing	Separate premises	Remarks
Benin	UNDP/WFP/UNCDF	UNICEF, UNFPA, WHO, FAO, IBRD	Negotiations under way to construct common premises with UNDP/ UNICEF/WFP/UNCDF/UNFPA.
Bhutan	UNDP/UNFPA/UNICEF/WFP/ FAO	WHO	
Bolivia	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNFDAC/ UNIC/FAO/UNIDO	UNICEF, IBRD, IMF, WHO	Proposals under way to construct common premises. UNDP and UNICEF have committed funds for this purpose.
Botswana	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP	UNHCR, WHO, UNICEF	
Brazil	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNIDO/ UNESCO/UNFDAC/UNIFEM	UNICEF, UNHCR, ILO, FAO, WHO, UNIC, IBRD, ECLAC	Government has donated land and arrangements under way to finance construction of common premises from private sector.
Burkina Faso	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNESCO/ FAO/UNCDF	IBRD, WHO, UNICEF, UNIC	
Burundi		UNDP, WHO, IBRD, UNIC, UNHCR, FAO, UNICEF, WFP, UNFPA	Negotiations under way to construct common premises, UNDP, UNICEF, WFP, UNFPA, have committed funds.
Cameroon	UNDP/UNIDO/UNFPA	UNHCR, FAO, WHO, IBRD, IMF, ILO, UNIC, ITU, UNICEF, WFP, ECA (MULPOC)	
Cape Verde	UNDP/WFP	FAO, WHO, UNICEF	Common premises under construction. UNDP, UNFPA, and UNICEF have committed funds for construction.

Country	Sharing	Separate premises	Remarks
Central African Republic	UNDP/WFP/UNCDF	UNHCR, FAO, WHO, IBRD, UNICEF	
Chad	UNDP/WFP/FAO	WHO, UNICEF, IBRD	
Chile		UNHCR, ILO, FAO, UNDP, UNICEF, UNESCO, WHO, ITU, ECLAC	
China	UNDP/UNHCR/WHO/UNFPA/ WFP/UNIDO	UNICEF, UNESCO, IBRD, ILO, FAO	
Colombia	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNDCP/ UNIDO	IBRD, FAO, ECLAC, WHO, UNIC, UNICEF, UNCHS	
Comoros	UNDP/WFP	WHO, UNICEF	Common premises under construction financed by UNDP and WFP.
Congo	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNHCR	UNICEF, FAO, IBRD, WHO, UNIC	
Costa Rica	UNDP/WFP/UNFPA	UNHCR, ILO, WHO, FAO, UNESCO, ECLAC, UDU, UNICEF	
Côte d'Ivoire	UNDP/UNFPA	WHO, IBRD, IFC, IMF, ILO, UNICEF, WFP, FAO, UNIDO	
Cuba	UNDP/WFP	UNESCO, FAO, WHO	
Cyprus		UNDP, UNHCR, FAO, UNFICYP	
Djibouti	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/WHO	UNHCR, FAO, UNICEF	
Dominican Republic	UNDP/FAO	UNICEF, WHO, INSTRAW (HQ)	
Ecuador	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNESCO/ UNCDP/UNIDO/UNIFEM	WHO, UNICEF, FAO	

Country	Sharing	Separate premises	Remarks
Egypt	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP	UNHCR, UNRWA, UNICEF, UNTSO, FAO, ILO, WHO, UNESCO, ICAO, UNIC, IMF, IFC	
El Salvador	UNDP/UNFPA/UNIC	UNHCR, FAO, WHO, UNICEF, WFP	
Equatorial Guinea	UNDP/WFP	WHO, FAO, UNICEF	Negotiations now under way to purchase common premises.
Ethiopia	UNDP/UNFPA/UNICEF/WFP/ ILO/UNESCO/ECA/UNIC/ WHO/UNIDO	UNHCR, UNREC, FAO, IBRD, ITU	
Fiji	UNFPA/UNIDO	WHO, ILO, UNICEF, UNDP	
Gabon	UNDP/UNFPA/UNFDAC/ UNHCR	WHO	Proposal made to lease additional floor for common premises.
Gambia	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNSO/ UNCDF	WHO, FAO, UNICEF	Negotiations under way to construct common premises. UNDP and UNICEF have committed funds for construction.
Ghana	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNHCR/ UNICEF	FAO, IBRD, IMF, WHO, UNIC	Existing common premises being expanded.
Guatemala	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNV	UNHCR, WHO, UNICEF, ONUCA	
Guinea	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNIDO	FAO, WHO, IBRD, UNICEF, IMF, UNCDF	
Guinea-Bissau		UNDP, UNICEF, FAO, WHO, WFP, UNCDF, UNFDA	Common premises under construction. UNDP and UNICEF have committed funds.
Guyana	UNDP/UNICEF/WFP/FAO	WHO	

Country	Sharing	Separate premises	Remarks
Haiti	UNDP/UNFPA/UNCDF	WHO, UNICEF, WFP, FAO, IMF	
Honduras	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNICEF/ UNHCR/UNIDO/ITC	FAO, WHO, ITU	
India	UNDP/UNFPA/UNIDO/UNIC/ FAO/IBRD	UNICEF, WFP, ILO, ITC, UNESCO, WHO, UNFDAC	
Indonesia	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNIDO/ ILO/WHO/UNESCO/FAO	IBRD, IMF, ITU, UNHCR, IFC, UNIC, UNICEF, ITU	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	UNDP/UNICEF/WFP/UNIC/ UNOCA	UNHCR, WHO	
Iraq	UNDP/UNHCR	ESCWA, FAO, WHO, UNICEF	
Jamaica	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNIDO	UNESCO, FAO, IMF, UNICEF, WHO, UNEP, UNLOS	
Jordan	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNCHS	UNRWA, WHO, UNTSO, UNICEF, UNHCR, UNESCO (UNEDBAS)	
Kenya	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNIDO	UNHCR, UNESCO, WHO, IBRD, IFC, ICAO, UNEP, UNIC, UNICEF, FAO, UNSO	
Kiribati		WHO*	
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	UNDP/UNFPA/UNICEF	WHO	
Kuwait		UNDP, ILO, UNESCO	
Lao People's Democratic Republic	UNDP/WFP	UNHCR, WHO, FAO, UNICEF	Negotiations under way for common premises. UNDP and UNICEF have committed funds.

Country	Sharing	Separate premises	Remarks
Lebanon	UNDP/WFP/UNARDOL/ UNIFIL	UNHCR, WHO, FAO, UNTSO, UNIC, UNESCO, UNICEF	
Lesotho	UNDP/UNCDF/UNFPA	UNICEF, WFP, UNHCR, FAO, WHO, UNIC	
Liberia	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNIC	UNICEF, UNHCR, FAO, WHO	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		UNDP, WHO, UNIC	
Madagascar	UNDP/UNIDO	UNICEF, UNFPA, WFP, WHO, ILO, IBRD, UNIC, IMF, FAO	
Malawi	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP	UNICEF, FAO, WHO, IBRD, UNHCR	
Malaysia	UNDP/UNFPA/UNESCO/ UNICEF/UNCTAD (GSP, ASYCUDA)/IMD/ITC/ UNV-DDS	UNHCR, WHO	
Maldives		UNDP, UNICEF, WHO	Common premises under construction and financed by UNDP.
Mali	UNDP/WFP	WHO, UNICEF, IBRD, IMF, FAO, UNFPA	
Mauritania		UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, WFP, FAO, WHO, IBRD	
Mauritius	UNFPA/WFP	UNICEF, UNDP, WHO**	
Mexico	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNEP/ UNIDO/ECLAC/UNIC/UNCHS	FAO, UNESCO, WHO, UNICEF, ILO, ICAO, IBRD, UNHCR	

Country	Sharing	Separate premises	Remarks
Mongolia		UNDP, WHO	
Morocco	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP	UNICEF, UNHCR, FAO, WHO, UNIC, ECA (SRO)	
Mozambique	UNDP/UNIDO/UNDRO	UNICEF, UNFPA, WFP, UNHCR, FAO, WHO	Construction of common premises is under consideration.
Myanmar	UNDP/UNIC/UNFPA/UNCDF/ UNIDO	WHO, FAO, UNFDAC, UNICEF	
Namibia	UNDP/UNICEF/FAO/WHO/ UNESCO/UNFPA/WFP		Government approved the donation of land free of all taxes.
Nepal	UNDP/UNFPA/UNICEF/FAO/ WHO/UNIC	IBRD, IMF, ITU	
Nicaragua	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNIC	UNHCR, FAO, WHO, UNICEF	
Niger	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/ ECA (MULPOC)	FAO, WHO, IBRD, UNICEF	
Nigeria	UNDP/UNFPA/UNIDO/ UNFDAC	UNHCR, FAO, WHO, ILO, IBRD, UNESCO, UNIC, UNICEF	
Oman		UNDP, UNICEF, WHO	
Pakistan	UNDP/FAO/WHO/UNFDAC/ UNIDO	UNICEF, UNFPA, WFP, UNHCR, ILO, UNIC, UNOCA, IBRD, UNILOG, UNMOGIP, UNESCO	Negotiations under way to construct common premises using private sector funding.
Panama	UNDP/UNFPA	UNICEF, WHO, UNIC	
Papua New Guinea	UNDP/UNICEF/UNHCR	WHO	
Paraguay	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNIC	UNICEF, WHO, WHO	
Peru	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNFDAC	UNICEF, ILO, FAO, UNIC, WHO, ICAO, UNIDO	

Country	Sharing	Separate premises	Remarks
Philippines	UNDP/UNFPA/ILO/UNICEF/ WFP/FAO/UNIC/UNIDO	UNHCR, WHO, IBRD, IMF, IFC	
Qatar		UNDP, UNESCO	
Republic of Korea	UNDP/UNFPA	UNICEF, WHO	
Romania	UNDP/UNIC		
Rwanda	UNDP/UNFPA/UNICEF/WFP/ UNV	UNHCR, WHO, FAO, IBRD, ECA (MULPOC)	
Samoa	UNDP/FAO/UNESCO	WHO	
Sao Tome and Principe	UNDP/WFP	WHO, UNICEF	Construction of common premises under way. UNDP and UNICEF have committed funds.
Saudi Arabia	UNDP/UNHCR/WFP	UNICEF, WHO, IBRD	
Senegal	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNIDO/ UNIFEM/UN/CAF/UNSO/ UNCDF	UNHCR, FAO, ILO, UNESCO, UNICEF, ICAO, UNIC, WHO, IBRD, UNITAR, ITU	
Sierra Leone	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNIDO/ WHO	UNICEF, UNHCR, FAO	Negotiations are under way on new building which when completed will house all United Nations agencies except UNICEF.
Singapore		WHO	
Somalia	UNDP/UNFPA	UNHCR, FAO, IBRD, UNICEF, WHO, WFP, IMF	Construction of common premises under way. UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF have committed funds for renovation in order to move into common premises.
Sri Lanka	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNIC/ FAO/UNIDO/ILO/UNV	WHO, IBRD, IMF, UNICEF, UNHCR	

/...

Country	Sharing	Separate premises	Remarks
Solomon Islands		WHO*	
Sudan	UNDP/WFP/UNIC/UNIDO	UNHCR, FAO, WHO, IBRD, UNICEF, IMF	
Suriname		WHO	
Swaziland	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP	UNHCR, WHO, UNICEF	
Syrian Arab Republic		UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, WFP, FAO, WHO, UNDOF, UNTSO	
Thailand	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNIC/ UNIDO/ILO/UNHCR/UNEP/ ESCAP	IBRD, ICAO, UNESCO, UNICEF, WHO, FAO	
Togo	UNDP/UNFPA/UNIDO/UNV/ DDS	UNICEF, WFP, UNHCR, IBRD, IMF, UNIC, WHO, FAO	Discussions under way between Government and JCGP members on premises or land for construction.
Tonga		WHO*	
Trinidad and Tobago		UNDP, FAO, WHO, ILO, UNIC, ECLAC	
Tunisia	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNIC	UNICEF, UNHCR, FAO, UNESCO, UNEP	
Turkey	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/ILO/ UNIC/FAO/UNIDO/WHO	UNHCR, IBRD, UNICEF	
Uganda	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP	UNHCR, IBRD, IMF, WHO, UNICEF, FAO	
United Republic of Tanzania	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNIDO	UNHCR, FAO, ILO, WHO, IBRD, UNESCO, UNICEF	
Uruguay		UNDP, FAO, ILO, WHO, ECLAC, IMF, UNESCO	
Vanuatu		WHO,* ESCAP (EPOC)	

Country	Sharing	Separate premises	Remarks
Venezuela		UNDP, WHO, UNESCO, UNHCR, UNICEF	
Viet Nam	UNDP/UNIDO	UNICEF, UNFPA, WFP, FAO, WHO, UNHCR	
Yemen	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP	UNICEF, WHO, FAO	
Yugoslavia	UNDP/UNIC	UNHCR	
Zaire	UNDP/UNFPA/ILO/WFP/ UNHCR/UNIC/UNIDO/FAO/ UNESCO	IBRD, UNICEF, WHO	Negotiations under way for construction of common premises using private sector funding.
Zambia	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNIDO	UNHCR, WHO, ILO, FAO, UNESCO, UNIC, ECA (MULPOC), UNICEF, IBRD, IMF	Construction of common premises reaching final stage.
Zimbabwe	UNDP/UNFPA/WFP/UNIDO	UNHCR, FAO, WHO, UNIC, UNESCO, IBRD, ITU, UNICEF	

* Liaison Office.

** National Coordinator.

a/ It is WHO policy, developed in consultation with its Member States, to place whenever possible the WHO Representative Office in or near the Ministry of Health, in order to maximize the technical advice and support provided by the Office to national health administrations for national health programmes development.